DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 042 541 RC 004 592

AUTHOR McNamara, Patrick H.
TITLE Some Factors Associated with Differential Grade Performance of Mexican American and Non-Mexican American College Students.
PUB DATE Mar 70
NOTE 16p.; Paper presented at annual meetings of the Southwestern Social Science Association (Dallas, Texas, March 1970)

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.90
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement, *Anglo Americans, *College Students, *Cross Cultural Studies, Dropouts, Educational Research, Grade Point Average, *Mexican Americans, Sex Differences, Socioeconomic Background

ABSTRACT

The study investigated an area of education in which few studies have been published: the area of the Mexican American college student. Most studies have focused on elementary and high school experiences because these have been the most frequent targets of militant Mexican American groups from California to south Texas; therefore, very little is known about Mexican American college students. Even in areas of the Southwest, where the Mexican Americans may number 50% of the total population, the college dropout rate is significantly high. El Paso, Texas, is such an area, yet only 30% of the enrollment at the University of Texas at El Paso (UTEP) is Mexican American. For purposes of this study, 782 students at UTEP filled out questionnaires. Of these, 760 were divided into 2 groups: those marking Mexican or Spanish American as their "predominant ethnic background" and those marking Anglo American. It was found that family background factors affecting Mexican American elementary and high school students seem to have little value in predicting success in college as measured by grade point average. If there is a set of ethnic-related factors which account for differences between the groups, it may be found in sociopsychological relationships on family and peer levels. This study strongly suggests that UTEP, for example, is not successfully recruiting more academically proficient students regardless of ethnicity. (EJ)

ED042541

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

SOME FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH DIFFERENTIAL GRADE PERFORMANCE OF MEXICAN AMERICAN AND NON-MEXICAN AMERICAN COLLEGE STUDENTS

by

Patrick H. McNamara

The University of Texas

at El Paso

(Paper Presented at Annual Meetings of the Southwestern Social Science Association, Dallas, Texas. March, 1970.)

"In most schools, Mexican Americans drop out readily and in all categories show inferior achievement."[1] This dismal conclusion comes from one of the chief researchers of UCLA's Mexican American Study Project, whose results are to be published this summer.[2] A formidable bibliography concerning the Mexican American student and the schools has been building for years; we have by no means seen the end of such studies.[3] The vast majority of these studies focuses on the critical elementary and high school experiences of Mexican American youngsters. And it is these schools, of course, which have been the most frequent targets of protest by militant Mexican American groups from Los Angeles to south Texas.

The disturbing drop-out rate of Mexican Americans, particularly during high school, has been a central concern of many of these studies.[4] Texas seems beset by this problem most acutely, as both Carter and Kuvlevsky and associates have pointed out.[5]

---

1. Joan Moore, Mexican Americans: Problems and Prospects. Madison, Wisc., Institute for Research on Poverty, The Univ. Of Wisc., 1968, p. 39.

2. Leo Grebler, Joan Moore, Ralph Guzman, et. al., The Mexican American People. New York: Macmillan-Free Press.

3. Cf. James E. Heathman and Cecilia J. Martinez, Mexican American Education: A selected Bibliography. Las Cruces, N.M., Educational Resources Information Center, New Mexico State University, 1969. A good coverage of these studies is also found in Thomas P. Carter, Mexican American In School: A History of Educational Neglect. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1970.

4. Paul M. Sheldon and E.F. Hunter, "Mexican Americans in Urban Public High Schools: An Exploration of the Drop-Out Problem." Los Angeles, The Lab. in Urban Culture, Occidental College, (mimeographed) 1964.

5. Carter, op. cit., pp.22-25; Sherry Wages, Katheryn Thomas and William P. Kuvlevsky, "Mexican American Teen-Age School Dropouts: Reasons for Leaving School and Orientations Toward Subsequent Educational Attainment." Paper presented at the Southwestern Soc. Science Assn. meetings, Houston, 1969.

RC 004592

In one large Texas school district, according to Carter, High schools serving very low socioeconomic areas have "a ratio of about two tenth graders to one twelfth grader."[6] In fact, Carter continues, "it seems reasonable to say that perhaps 60% of the children of Mexican descent who begin Texas schools do not finish high school."[7] While the situation may be improving currently, this is small comfort to those adult Mexican Americans who realize all too well the handicaps they experience because of insufficient schooling.

But what about Mexican American college students? We have, unfortunately, very few published studies of this group of students. Available data, however, suggest the presence of problems well worth investigating. In 1960, writes Joan Moore,

> Only 13% of the Mexican Americans graduated from college against 23% of the Anglos....Roughly half as many Mexican American young women attend or complete college as do men.

The University of Texas at Austin, reports Carter, had a total Spanish-surname enrollment (and this includes foreign students) of approximately 2.8% of the entire University in 1966-67, or about one-sixth the percentage of Mexican Americans in the State of Texas.[9] Carter's data for the same year from seven Southwestern colleges and universities[10] show that Spanish-surname students begin freshman year "at percentages approximating 50% of their percentage in the local population," but "apparently suffer from a higher attrition rate than other groups."[11] The gap between freshman and sophomore year is particularly striking: for men, the drop is from 16% to 11%; for women, from 10% to 6%.

Padilla and Long at the University of New Mexico, using the 1963 entering class at the University, calculated in 1968 the percentages, respectively, of Spanish-American and "other" students who had dropped out of college. The percentages of both groups are high: for "others," 61%; for Spanish-surname, 70%.[12] A five year study at

---

6. Carter, op. cit., p. 28.

7. Ibid, p. 28.

8. Joan Moore, op. cit., p. 23.

9. Carter, op. cit., p. 29.

10. The institutions are the University of Ariz., Univ. of Calif. at Riverside, Univ. of Colorado, Calif. State College at Los Angeles, Northern Ariz. Univ., The Univ. of Tex.(Austin), and New Mexico Highlands University.

11. Carter, op. cit., p. 31, Table 6.

12. Amado M. Padilla and Karl. K. Long, "An Assessment of Successful Spanish-American students at the Univ. of New Mexico." Paper presented at the Rocky Mt. Psychological Assn. meetings, Albuquerque, 1969.

the Univ. of Ariz. includes the following dismaying computation,

> for everyone of these students who successfully completes a degree within a given period of five years, approximately four of his peers will tend possibly to withdraw or to drop out for a semester or more.[13]

Explanations have been advanced for these manifest disparities. The Arizona study just cited lists the college students own reasons for "fading out": financial problems, are rated highest; health and job interference follow; military service is the fourth. Ralph Guzman of the University of California at Santa Cruz takes another tack: He charges the universities themselves with unpreparedness. They "often hold too rigid admissions standards and teaching norms that make academic success for youngsters from disadvantaged backgrounds difficult."[14] The universities, he continues, also "have a low degree of interaction with surrounding communities." From the point of view of the students themselves, Guzman suggests the following factors: carrying too many units; working too many hours after school; inability to make use of all college resources such as the library; lack of writing and consequent failure to pass essay exams; oral paralysis in the classroom; failure to confront professors and to accept professional offers of help.

These and other factors may well be associated with the statistics presented above. But we still have a paucity of data and still fewer attempts to explore the "whys" of the discouraging picture to be found in southwestern institutions of higher education.

The present study is a modest attempt to begin to fill this "data gap." It seeks to locate socioeconomic and high school experience factors associated with one expression of Mexican American college performance: semester grade point average. The locale is the University of Texas at El Paso. Slightly over 30% of a student body of 10,500 students are Americans of Mexican descent. These statistics are the basis of the University's claim to have the largest Mexican American enrollment of any college or university in the United States.

The University finds itself, not surprisingly, beset by the same problems discussed so far. The drop-out rate of Mexican American students: fall semester enrollment statistics for 1969 showed 36% of the freshman class is Mexican American; the figures drop to 32%, 28%, 24%, and 22% for sophomore, junior, senior, and graduate statuses, respectively.[15] These statistics are more meaningful when one considers that the El Paso area is almost 50% Mexican American.

---

13. Univ. of Ariz., "Indications of Trends in Academic Progress of Spanish-Surname Students, 1962-1967." Tucson, Ariz.(mimeographed).

14. Ralph Guzman, Address before personnel of U.S. Office of Education, 1967.

15. Data on the University of Texas at El Paso supplied by the University's Office of Educational Research.

The present study stems from the author's experience in teaching Spanish surname students at this University. These students as a group appeared to perform at a less satisfactory level than other students. It was decided at the beginning of the spring semester of 1969 to administer a questionnaire to all students taking introductory sociology. A total of 782 students filled out the questionnaire. Of these, 760 were found to be usable.

Items were chosen on the basis of what other studies had deemed significant for various facets of Mexican American school performance. Wayne Gordon, educational sociologist of UCLA's Mexican American Study Project, had found language spoken at home, family economic level and family educational level to be significant. His findings, as interpreted by Carter: "the academic success of a Mexican American child depends on the degree to which his home has been oriented to Anglo middle-class culture."[16] Are thses factors also associated with academic success on the college level? In addition to Gordon, the Coleman report as analyzed by the staff of the U.S. Office of Education, concluded that for Mexican Americans in the Coleman survey, "family background is most important for achievement" and that " the association of family background with achievement does not diminish over the years."[17] The study begins, then, with an assessment of the impact of "family factors" on grade performance: sex of student, number of siblings living at home, combined parental income, parents' educational attainment, amount of Spanish spoken at home.

A second set of factors, which may be conceived as "modifying" home background, concern high schools attended and senior year academic performance and standing.

The third set of factors may be thought of as contemporaneous with college experience: marital status, veteran status, and number of hours per week of employment.

The major dependent variable, grade point average for the spring semester of 1969, was obtained at the end of that semester from the registrar's office at the University and added to each questionnaire.

The analysis decided upon in this presentation divides the respondents into two groups: those checking "Mexican(or Spanish) American in the item asking for "my predominant ethnic background." The "control group" consists of all those checking "Anglo-American" in the same item. The sizes of the resulting groups from the usable questionnaires are 252 Mexican American respondents (non-U.S.

---

16. Wayne C. Gordon, et. al., Educational Achievement and Aspirations of Mexican-American Youth in a Metropolitan Context. Mexican American Study Project, UCLA, 1968. Quote in Carter, op.cit., p. 19.

17. George W. Mayeske, "Educational Achievement Among Mex.-Americans: A Special Report from the Educational Opportunities Survey." Unofficial analysis of Coleman etal., 1966. Washington,D.C.: National Center for Educational Statistics, U.S. Office of Education, Technical Note 22, Jan. 9, 1967. Quoted in Carter, op. cit., p. 20.

citizens were excluded) and 452 "Anglo-Americans" respondents.[18]

Semester grade point average was divided into three categories. The lowest, "below 2.0" includes but is not the same as probationary students (generally below 1.5); as a general category, it indicates unsatisfactory academic performance, i.e., the student is "in trouble." The "C" students form the second category (2.0-2.9); those making Bs and As occupy the third grouping, 3.0+.

The Analysis

Table 1 (Mexican American percentages are given in red ink throughout the tables) displays the basic "grade gap" between the two groups. Note that Mexican American students differ from Anglo-American students on each end of the grade spectrum by almost identical percentage points: a 12% difference in the below 2.0 group, 13% in the 3.0+ group.

Figures cited by Carter in his analysis of the seven southwestern universities mentioned earlier "suggest that women do not survive so well as men, and they point up the high attrition rate."[19] Table 2 shows little difference between men and women among Mexican Americans, though Anglo American girls do notably better than Anglo boys in the 3.0+ grouping.

Other studies [20] indicate a tendency for children from smaller families to perform better on the elementary and high school levels. An opposite pattern for Mexican Americans emerges in Table 3, and holds true though less clearly, for Anglo Americans as well. Income categories (Table 4) reveal expected trends for Mexican Americans in the below 2.0 group (though not for Anglos), but higher income proves of slight advantage to Mexican Americans in the 3.0+ column. The Anglo American students provide the surprise here: among 3.0+ students, a striking inverse relationship between GPA and income appears, a finding which will receive comment in the conclusion of this study.

A further puzzle is the inverse relationship between mother's educational level (Table 5) and semester GPA for both ethnic groupings (though the Anglo American pattern is less pronounced in the

---

18. The remaining categories with corresponding numbers of respondents were Negro(Afro)-American, 19; American Indian, 1; Oriental, 2; Foreign Students, 6; Other, 27.

19. Carter, op. cit., p. 32.

20. Cf. Celia S. Heller, Mexican American Youth: Forgotten Youth at the Crossroads. New York: Random House, 1966, p. 32; I. Roger Yoshino and Angela Garcia, "The Mexican-American Family and Intellectual Achievement," paper presented to The American Sociological Association Meetings, San Francisco, California, 1969.

below 2.0 category). Educational level of father turns out to be a poor predictor of the dependent variable (Table 6).

Table 7, if one judges by previous studies, would be expected to reveal some strong relationships. Gordon and associates state rather categorically, "The exclusive use of English contributes consistently and positively for Mexican American pupils at all grade levels."[21] Anderson and Johnson found a negative relationship between high school English grades and amount of Spanish spoken in the home.[22] It is interesting that only 10 students indicated that English was used exclusively in their homes, and though the "n's" are small, Table 7 shows no advantage accruing to this grouping in terms of high semester GPA. The remainder of the table does show a tendency in the expected negative direction, but it is very slight until the "always" category. The latter students seem clearly handicapped by exclusive use of Spanish. But a "mixed" language usage at home does not clearly seem to be detrimental to college academic success.

Table 8 introduces the second set of controls: high school experience. From the results of the Gordon study, one would not expect the results appearing in Table 8. In Los Angeles, Mexican American elementary, junior and senior high school students "perform better in schools that have a low percentage of minority-group pupils."[23] It is reasonable to expect that such a high school experience would be reflected in greater college success. Precisely the opposite appears in this table, i.e., the percentages set down in the "low ethnic, middle SES" row. What is even more arresting is the notably higher performance of Anglo-American students from precisely these schools.

Further probing into the high school and college GPA relationships appears in Tables 9, 10, and 11. A 3.0+ high school GPA does not close the gap between Mexican American and Anglo-American students in either low or high semester GPA groupings (Table 9). Top quartile standing (Table 10) is the first indication of the closing of the gap (equal percentages of both ethnic groups appear in the 3.0+ column), but one or both of these tables may reflect the factor of self-assessment. Furthermore, approximately 15% of each ethnic group left both high school GPA and quartile standing unanswered. Second quartile standing, however, does show a marked broadening of the gap between the two ethnic groups with regard to semester GPA.

Perhaps the most significant table in this series is #11, indicating semester GPA by both type of high school (ethnic concentration combined with SES) and senior year high school GPA. As in Table 8, only the last category of high schools (low ethnic, middle SES) con-

---

21. Quoted in Carter, op. cit., p. 19.

22. James G. Anderson and William H. Johnson, "Sociocultural Determinates of Achievements among Mexican American Students." Paper prepared for the National Conference of Educational Opportunities for Mexican-Americans. Las Cruces: New Mexico State Univ., 1968.

23. Carter, op. cit., p. 72.

tained enough Anglo-American respondents to permit comparison with Mexican Americans from the same high schools. Although the "n's" are small and sampling error may be operative, the stark figures show that only 1 out of 19 Mexican Americans graduating from high school with a 3.0+ senior year GPA obtained a comparable college GPA, whereas 6 out of 23 Anglo-American with comparable high school performance achieved a high college GPA. This discrepancy may reflect the phenomenon discovered by Gordon and associates, i.e., in precisely this type of school, teachers' grading practices are "ascriptive," that is, they tend to "overgrade" minority group pupils on the assumption that "most of them" are destined for lower status positions anyway, and that some upgrading reduces potential friction between school and community - "trying to keep everybody happy."[24] (It may also, of course, reflect the opposite practice, should one desire to "make a case" from the percentage of each ethnic group making 3.0+ in senior year of high school: 61% of the Anglo-Americans; 55% of the Mexican Americans; but this obviously fails to account for the in-group discrepancy in college 3.0+ performance).

Tables 12 and 13 clearly indicate that marital and veteran status, respectively, make a significant impact on the GPA of Anglo-American students, but have little impact on Mexican Americans. Factors associated with Mexican American ethnicity appear to be still operative.

Number of hours working, too, has greater depressive effect upon Mexican American than upon Anglo-American grade performance (Table 14). Through a regretable oversight, however, number of class hours taken by each respondent was not asked for in the questionnaire, severely diminishing the real value of this table.

Table 15, giving GPA performance by classes, provides the optimistic note of this study. Mexican American students who do make it past freshman year begin rather rapidly to catch up with Anglo-Americans in subsequent years of their university "careers." Though the "n's" are unfortunately small for junior and senior years, the data show no intergroup discrepancy on the 3.0-4.0 level, though the gap continues in the below 2.0 category.

Conclusions

Whatever effect family background factors may have upon Mexican American elementary and high school pupils, they seem of little value in this study with respect to prediction of college success as measured by one semester's grade point average. This phenomenon may simply mean that the sorting process by which high school students make it to college involves an overcoming of these factors which seemingly do affect the majority of high school students. The college group

---

24. C. Wayne Gordon, et al., "The Educational Gap," in Leo Grebler, Joan W.Moore, and Ralph C. Guzman, (eds.), The Mexican-American People. (New York: The free Press, forthcoming).

is composed precisely of those who have triumphed over factors handicapping the majority.[25]

However, this explanation leaves unaccounted for such findings as the inverse relationships between GPA and mother's education, or, among Anglo-American students, income and high GPA performance. It fails to explain the "no relationship" finding between father's education and semester GPA; it does not cover the poorer performance of Mexican Americans from the "low ethnic schools."

A more cogent explanation, perhaps, is that the University of Texas at El Paso, like many another community-college-recently-made-university, has not as yet attained community prestige sufficient to attract the area's best high school students, regardless of ethnicity. As a result, parents from higher income brackets (who would be predominantly Anglo-Americans in this study) able to send their sons and daughters whose high school grades, etc., warrant it, to more prestigious out-of-town universities, simply do so. The table concerning income and GPA (Table 4) apparently says that higher income Anglo-American students at the University are "residuals" - they could not "make it" to one of the more "desired" out-of-town universities. The findings also suggest that veterans and married students among the Anglo-Americans are those with lesser mobility and who would be expected to remain in the area. Thus there is comparatively little "siphoning off" of these groups to institutions outside the city.

If the vast majority of Mexican American parents and veteran and married students cannot command the income for out-of-town education, how, then, account for the poorer performance of Mexican American students in freshman year? Ascriptive grading practices may be part of the answer, as suggested above. But the controls utilized in this study shed very little light on this problem. If there is some set of ethnic-related factors which "really" account for the discrepancies shown in this study, they may be located in socio-psychological relationships on both family and peer levels, i.e., factors identified in the familiar "achievement motivation" studies.[26] However, one would be foolish to neglect school and community fostered discriminatory patterns. As Carter insightfully observes,

---

25. This study does, however, show a higher proportion of lowest income students in the below 2.0 category (Table 4), but this group does not show a significantly lower percentage in the 3.0+ category than all Mexican American respondents taken together.

26. Cf. for example, "The Psychocultural Origins of Achievement and Achievement Motivation among Mexican-Americans," by James G. Anderson, Paper presented at the meetings of the Southwestern Social Science Association, Dallas, Texas, March, 1970.

> There is no one explanation of why Juanito can't read, is "poorly motivated," and flees the school early to assume the low status traditional for his group. Rather, the factors become obvious by careful examination and analysis of: (1) the natures of the diverse Mexican American subcultures and the socialization afforded their young, (2) the kind and quality of formal education provided and the school social climates promoted by local practices, and (3) the nature of the local and regional social systems and the equal or unequal opportunity they provide the Mexican American. No simplistic or single explanation is possible.[27]

What the present study strongly suggests, however, is that the University of Texas at El Paso is not successfully recruiting the more academically proficient high school students from the El Paso area, regardless of ethnicity. Strong indications (this is a topic obviously inviting further research) point to the incursions of out-of city recruting teams in the El Paso area. Local high schools have apparently been the targets of Universities from all over the United States, most particularly California, whose universities and state colleges are making special efforts to recruit Mexican American students - partially, of course, in response to the miniscule percentages of this ethnic group to be found in most southwestern institutions of higher learning.

The University of Texas at El Paso, however, is probably by no means unique. Surely one may come across in the Southwest other similar "community" institutions who can point with pride to the large numbers of Mexican American students. Such large numbers are desirable, of course, expecially in terms of an ethnic group so long denied adequate educational opportunities. But from the standpoint of the institutions themselves, can they remain satisfied with the ego-damaging fact that many of the more talented local students are wooed elsewhere? Might it be suggested, too, that from among these students would come a large number of those who could critically challenge the college to improve its resources - faculty, library, special programs, (e.g., an honors course), and create an atmosphere of more personally and socially relevant teaching and research?

---

27. Thomas P. Carter, "Mexican Americans and the School," The College Board Review (forthcoming).

TABLES FOR: "SOME FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH DIFFERENTIAL GRADE PERFORMANCE BETWEEN MEXICAN AMERICAN AND NON-MEXICAN AMERICAN COLLEGE STUDENTS"
(MA=Mexican Americans; AA=Anglo-Americans)

TABLE 1 -- SEMESTER GRADE POINT AVERAGES OF MEXICAN AMERICAN AND ANGLO AMERICAN STUDENTS

	Below 2.0	2.0-2.9	3.0-4.0	Incomplete	total
M-A	47% (118)	39% (98)	10% (25)	4% (11)	100% (252)
A-A	35% (162)	32%(155)	23% (104)	8% (31)	98% (452)

TABLE 2 -- SEMESTER GRADE POINT AVERAGES ACCORDING TO SEX

Sex	Below 2.0		2.0-2.9		3.0-4.0		Incomplete		Total	
	MA	AA	MA	AA	MA	AA	MA	AA	MA	AA
Male	48%(69)	37%(97)	38%(55)	37%(97)	8%(12)	20%(53)	6%(9)	6%(15)	100%(145)	100%(262)
Fem.	46%(49)	34%(65)	40%(43)	30%(57)	12%(13)	27%(51)	2%(2)	9%(16)	100%(107)	100%(189)

x^2 for MA=1.28 < .05
x^2 for AA=3.77 < .05

TABLE 3 -- SEMESTER G P A ACCORDING TO SIBLINGS (ONLY RESPONDENTS REPORTING LIVING AT HOME)

# of Siblings	G P A: Below 2.0		2.0-2.9		3.0-4.0		Inc.		Total	
	MA	AA	MA	AA	MA	AA	MA	AA	MA	AA
0-2	53%(31)	41%(56)	34%(20)	33%(45)	8%(5)	18%(24)	5%(3)	8%(11)	100%(59)	100%(136)
3-5	51%(54)	49%(36)	35%(38)	34%(25)	9%(9)	11%(8)	4%(4)	7%(5)	99%(105)	101%(74)
over 5	43%(13)	30%(3)	40%(12)	40%(4)	13%(4)	20%(2)	3%(1)	10%(1)	99%(30)	100%(51)

x^2 for MA=1.0 < .05
x^2 for AA=5.81 < .05

TABLE 4 -- COMBINED INCOME OF PARENTS AND G P A

Income	G P A									
	Below 2.0		2.0-2.9		3.0-4.0		Inc.		Total	
	MA	AA	MA	AA	MA	AA	MA	AA	MA	AA
Below $5,000	54%(37)	34%(12)	32%(22)	14%(5)	10%(7)	40%(14)	4%(3)	11%(4)	100%(69)	99%(35)
$5,000-$9,999	41%(44)	36%(43)	44%(48)	38%(46)	11%(12)	21%(25)	4%(4)	5%(6)	100%(108)	100%(120)
$10,000 & over	48%(14)	36%(79)	31%(9)	33%(73)	14%(4)	22%(49)	7%(2)	7%(19)	100%(29)	98%(220)

x^2 for MA = 3.96 < .05; AA = 29.37 > .01

TABLE 5 -- EDUCATIONAL LEVEL OF MOTHER AND G P A

Ed. of Mother	G P A									
	Below 2.0		2.0-2.9		3.0-4.0		Inc.		Total	
	MA	AA	MA	AA	MA	AA	MA	AA	MA	AA
8th gr. or less	42%(50)	31%(11)	44%(52)	28%(10)	12%(15)	36%(13)	2%(2)	5%(2)	100%(119)	100%(36)
Some High School	45%(24)	34%(16)	40%(21)	45%(21)	9%(5)	18%(8)	6%(3)	4%(2)	100%(53)	101%(47)
High Sch. Grad.	56%(28)	38%(74)	32%(16)	34%(66)	6%(3)	21%(41)	6%(3)	7%(13)	100%(50)	100%(194)
Tried College or more	60%(12)	35%(57)	30%(6)	35%(57)	10%(2)	25%(40)	0%(0)	5%(9)	100%(20)	100%(163)

TABLE 6 -- EDUCATIONAL LEVEL OF FATHER AND G P A

Ed. of Father	G P A									
	Below 2.0		2.0-2.9		3.0-4.0		Inc.		Total	
	MA	AA	MA	AA	MA	AA	MA	AA	MA	AA
8th gr. or less	47%(56)	29%(15)	41%(49)	27%(14)	10%(12)	35%(18)	2%(2)	8%(4)	100%(119)	99%(51)
Some High School	42%(19)	33%(20)	40%(18)	38%(23)	11%(5)	22%(13)	7%(3)	7%(3)	100%(45)	100%(60)
High Sch. Grad.	50%(26)	40%(52)	37%(19)	35%(45)	6%(3)	19%(24)	7%(4)	6%(8)	100%(52)	100%(129)
Tried College or more	48%(14)	35%(71)	34%(10)	36%(72)	17%(5)	24%(48)	0%(0)	5%(11)	100%(29)	100%(202)

TABLE 7 -- SEMESTER G P A AND SPANISH SPOKEN IN THE HOME
(MEXICAN AMERICAN STUDENTS ONLY)

Amount of Spanish Spoken at Home	G P A				
	Below 2.0	2.0-2.9	3.0-4.0	Inc.	Total
Never	40% (4)	40% (4)	10% (1)	10% (1)	100% (10)
Less than half	44% (28)	41%(26)	11% (7)	3% (2)	99% (63)
About half the time	48% (35)	37%(27)	10% (7)	5% (4)	100% (73)
Over half the time	45% (24)	40%(21)	15%(8)	0% (0)	100% (53)
Always	52% (27)	37%(19)	4%(2)	8% (4)	101% (52)

TABLE 8 -- SEMESTER G P A AND HIGH SCHOOLS ACCORDING TO ETHNIC CONCENTRATION AND SES STATUS (MEXICAN AMERICAN STUDENTS ONLY)

High Schools	G P A				
	Below 2.0	2.0-2.9	3.0-4.0	Inc.	Total
High Ethnic Low SES (2 schools)	40%(16)	40%(16)	17%(7)	3%(1)	100%(39)
High Ethnic Middle SES (3 schools)	49%(36)	37%(26)	12%(9)	3%(2)	101%(73)
Low Ethnic Middle SES (2 schools)	52%(15)	38%(11)	3%(1)	7%(2)	100%(29)
Low Ethnic Middle SES ANGLO students	32%(12)	37%(14)	24%(9)	7%(3)	100%(38)

x^2 for MA only (first 3 rows)=5.79 $<$.05
x^2 for MA & AA from "mixed" schools=6.17 $>$.05 $<$.01

TABLE 9 -- SEMESTER G P A AND SENIOR YEAR HIGH SCHOOL GPA

High School Sr. Yr. GPA	G P A									
	Below 2.0		2.0-2.9		3.0-4.0		Inc.		Total	
	MA	AA	MA	AA	MA	AA	MA	AA	MA	AA
Below 2.0	25%(1)	56%(9)	25%(1)	25%(4)	0%(0)	6%(1)	50%(2)	13%(2)	100%(4)	100%(16)
2.0-2.9	63%(59)	42%(73)	31%(29)	37%(64)	2%(2)	13%(22)	4%(4)	9%(16)	100%(94)	100%(175)
3.0-4.0	37%(45)	27%(57)	45%(54)	35%(73)	17%(20)	32%(66)	2%(2)	6%(12)	100%(121)	100%(208)

x^2 for MA = 20.51 $>$.01
x^2 for AA = 20.92 $>$.01

TABLE 10 -- SEMESTER G P A AND SENIOR YEAR HIGH SCHOOL SELF-ASSESSED STANDING BY QUARTILES

High Sch. Standing by Quartiles	Below 2.0		2.0-2.9		3.0-4.0		Inc.		Total	
	MA	AA	MA	AA	MA	AA	MA	AA	MA	AA
1st (top) Quartile	23%(19)	34%(40)	55%(46)	42%(49)	19%(16)	19%(22)	2%(2)	5%(6)	99%(83)	100%(117)
2nd Quartile	61%(15)	32%(53)	29%(26)	44%(72)	8%(7)	14%(23)	2%(2)	10%(17)	100%(90)	100%(165)
3rd Quartile	58%(23)	56%(44)	32%(13)	31%(24)	3%(1)	8%(6)	8%(3)	5%(4)	101%(40)	100%(78)
4th Quartile	33%(3)	55%(11)	56%(5)	20%(4)	0%(0)	15%(3)	11%(1)	10%(2)	100%(9)	100%(20)

TABLE 11 -- SEMESTER G P A AND SENIOR YEAR HIGH SCHOOL G P A BY ETHNIC CONCENTRATION AND SES (Mexican Americans only except for low Ethnic, Middle SES)

	Semester G P A: Below 2.0 — HS G P A 2.0-2.9/3.0+		Semester G P A: 2.0-2.9 — HS G P A 2.0-2.9/3.0+		Semester G P A: 3.0-4.0 — HS G P A 2.0-2.9/3.0+		Semester G P A: Inc. — HS G P A 2.0-2.9/3.0+		Total HS G P A	
High Ethnic Low SES	38%(3)	39%(13)	38%(3)	39%(13)	12%(1)	21%(7)	12%(1)	0%(0)	100%(8)	99%(33)
High Ethnic Middle SES	67%(28)	23%(7)	29%(12)	53%(16)	2%(1)	20%(6)	2%(1)	3%(1)	100%(42)	99%(30)
Low Ethnic Middle SES	73%(11)	42%(8)	20%(3)	47%(9)	0%(0)	5%(1)	7%(1)	5%(1)	100%(15)	99%(19)
(Anglo) Low Ethnic Middle SES	(5)	(7)	(5)	(9)	(3)	(6)	(2)	(1)	(15)	99%(23)

x^2 for MA only (first three rows):

$3.52 < .05$

TABLE 12 -- SEMESTER G P A AND MARITAL STATUS*

Marital Status	Below 2.0		2.0-2.9		3.0-4.0		Inc.		Total	
	MA	AA	MA	AA	MA	AA	MA	AA	MA	AA
Single	47%(101)	43%(143)	39%(83)	34%(114)	9%(19)	15%(51)	5%(10)	7%(24)	100%(213)	99%(332)
Married	44%(17)	12%(12)	38%(15)	37%(37)	15%(6)	46%(46)	3%(1)	5%(5)	100%(39)	100%(100)

*Only 19 respondents, all designating themselves Anglo-American, reported themselves as either separated, divorced, or widowed.

x^2 for MA = 1.46 $<$ .05
x^2 for AA = 25.16 $>$ .01

TABLE 13 -- SEMESTER G P A AND VETERAN STATUS (men only)

Veteran Status	G P A: Below 2.0		2.0-2.9		3.0-4.0		Inc.		Total	
	MA	AA	MA	AA	MA	AA	MA	AA	MA	AA
Veteran	49%(30)	22%(15)	34%(21)	35%(24)	10%(6)	33%(23)	7%(4)	10%(7)	100%(61)	100%(69)
Non-Vet	46%(38)	43%(81)	40%(33)	38%(72)	7%(6)	16%(30)	7%(5)	4%(7)	100%(82)	101%(190)

x^2 for MA = .64 $<$ .05
x^2 for AA = 13.94 $>$ .01

TABLE 14 -- SEMESTER G P A AND WORK HOURS PER WEEK

Working Hrs/Wk	Below 2.0		2.0-2.9		3.0-4.0		Inc.		Total	
	MA	AA	MA	AA	MA	AA	MA	AA	MA	AA
-0-	42%(55)	37%(104)	41%(53)	32%(90)	12%(15)	25%(70)	5%(7)	7%(19)	100%(130)	100%(283)
1-15	35%(12)	29%(10)	47%(16)	31%(11)	12%(4)	29%(10)	6%(2)	11%(4)	100%(34)	100%(35)
16-29	56%(20)	31%(18)	39%(14)	41%(24)	3%(1)	19%(11)	3%(1)	9%(5)	101%(36)	100%(58)
30-40	64%(28)	39%(26)	30%(13)	42%(28)	5%(2)	15%(10)	2%(1)	4%(3)	101%(44)	100%(67)
over 40	38%(3)	50%(4)	25%(2)	13%(1)	38%(3)	38%(3)	0%(0)	0%(0)	101%(8)	101%(8)

TABLE 15 -- SEMESTER G P A ACCORDING TO COLLEGE CLASSIFICATION

Class	Below 2.0		2.0-2.9		3.0-4.0		Incomplete		Total	
	MA	AA	MA	AA	MA	AA	MA	AA	MA	AA
Freshman	53(99)	44(123)	36(68)	30(85)	6(11)	19(53)	5(10)	7(19)	100(188)	100(280)
Sophomore	21(7)	24(26)	56(19)	41(44)	21(7)	27(29)	3(1)	7(8)	101(34)	99(107)
Junior	31(5)	15(5)	38(6)	50(17)	31(5)	29(10)	0(0)	6(2)	100(16)	100(34)
Senior	50(2)	7(1)	0(0)	36(5)	50(2)	50(7)	0(0)	7(1)	100(4)	100(14)

x^2 for MA (freshmen, sophomore & juniors only) = 42.81 $>$ .01
x^2 for AA (") = 21.36 $>$ .01